



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,043	02/06/2002	Curtis R. Primm	P000449/1308C	4191

7590 11/06/2002
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN-CHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,043

Applicant(s)

PRIEM, CURTIS R.

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Objection

1. Under certain circumstances an application for patent is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior nonprovisional application or provisional application which has at least one common inventor. The conditions are specified in 35 U.S.C. 120 and 35 U.S.C. 119(e).
2. One requirement of these statutes is that the current application contains a specific reference to the first application. This reference must be the first sentence of the specification following the title, and it should preferably be specified as a separate paragraph (see MPEP 201.11, 37 CFR 1.78(a)).
3. Therefore, until the specification is updated accordingly, applicants do not have the benefit of the earlier filing date of application 09/274,200.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
5. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

Art Unit: 2672

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application, and all other rejections have been overcome. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

6. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,421,059. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reason: The elements of the present application's claim 1 constitute a subset of the elements of the patented claim 1, only the element of the patented application's claim 1 is moved to claim 14 as is dependent on claim 1 of the present application. To be more specific, the patented application's claim 1 has an additional limitation of "the graphics controller comprises a set of registers for utilizing the information within the plurality of font arrays such that font characters can be efficiently retrieved from memory and can then be rendered in the memory" over the claim 1 of the present application. The present application has instead set forth the above-mentioned limitation in claim 14 that is dependent on claim 1 of the present application. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the claim made in this application, because it is only a subset of what has been claimed before.

Specification

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: A missing period is found on page 6, line 20. On page 7, line 5, "Th" should read "The". On page 9, line 10, "larger

Art Unit: 2672

than” should be “smaller than”. On page 12, line 11, “bites” should read “bits”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

9. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 2, “per pixels” should read “per pixel”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claims 21-23 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The glyph information register appears in the claims, but it is not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

((b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2672

13. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lobodzinski U.S. Patent No. 5,734,873.

14. Claim 1:

The Lobodzinski reference has taught a system for rendering fonts into a memory (see figure 1 of the reference) comprising a data structure located within a memory (frame buffer 56 of figure 2) or other memories (memory 24 of figure 1) and the data structure including at least one font array (i.e., font 1 of reference sign 62a and font 2 of reference sign 62b of figure 3 in the reference); and a graphics controller (see figure 2 of the reference) for accessing at least one font array and for rendering characters of at least one font array into the appropriate locations of a memory (i.e., frame buffer 56 of figure 2). It is noted that the Office has interpreted the display controller of the Lobodzinski reference as the graphics controller of the claimed invention because the display controller of figure 2 of the reference performs the same functions as the graphics controller of the claimed invention. It is further noted that the reference implicitly teaches that the graphics controller increases the speed of certain operations and displays selected operations at high speed rather than using the CPU to perform the operation (see the summary of the reference, and column 1, lines 13-49).

Claim 2:

The claim 2 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of "a frame buffer." However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a frame buffer (reference numeral 30 of figure 2). Therefore, the claim 2 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 3:

The claim 2 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of “a system memory.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a system memory (reference numeral 24 of figure 1). Therefore, the claim 3 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 4:

The claim 4 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of “a plurality of characters.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that font 1 comprises a plurality of characters C0-C256 and font 2 comprises a plurality of characters C0-C96 (figure 3A). Therefore, the claim 4 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 5:

The claim 5 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 4 except additional claimed limitation of “each of the characters comprises one bit per pixel.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters C0-C256 comprises one bit per pixel (figure 3A). Therefore, the claim 5 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 6:

The claim 6 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 4 except additional claimed limitation of “each of the characters comprises a plurality of bits per pixels.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters C0-C256 comprises a plurality of bits per pixel (figure 3B). Therefore, the claim 6 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 7:

The claim 7 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of “at least one font array comprises a plurality of font arrays.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that at least one font array comprises a plurality of font arrays (figure 4A). Therefore, the claim 7 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 8:

The claim 8 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 7 except additional claimed limitation of “each of the plurality of font arrays includes a plurality of characters.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the plurality of font arrays includes a plurality of characters (figures 3B and 4B). Therefore, the claim 8 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 9:

The claim 9 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 8 except additional claimed limitation of “characters within different font arrays can be different sizes.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that characters within different font arrays can be different sizes (figures 4B and 5). Therefore, the claim 9 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 10:

The claim 10 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 9 except additional claimed limitation of “each of the characters comprises a bit per pixel.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters comprises a bit per

Art Unit: 2672

pixel (figures 4B and column 4, lines 5-21). Therefore, the claim 10 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 11:

The claim 11 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 9 except additional claimed limitation of "each of the characters comprises a plurality of bits per pixel." However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters comprises a plurality of bits per pixel (column 5, lines 54-65). Therefore, the claim 11 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 12:

The claim 12 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 9 except additional claimed limitation of "each of the characters includes size height information." However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters includes size height information (column 6, lines 60-65). Therefore, the claim 13 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 13:

The claim 13 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 9 except additional claimed limitation of "each of the characters includes size width information." However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that each of the characters includes size width information (column 6, lines 60-65). Therefore, the claim 13 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

15. Claim 14:

Art Unit: 2672

The claim 14 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of “the graphics controller comprises a set of registers for utilizing the information within the plurality of font arrays such that font characters can be efficiently retrieved from memory and can then be rendered in the memory.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention in figure 2 where the graphics controller comprises a set of registers inside BLT ENGINE 50, TEXT ENGINE 52 and OTHER ENGINE 54. It is further noted that elements of the graphics controller shown in discrete components in the reference can be combined in a variety of fashions and should be still within the scope of Lobodzinski’s invention, e.g., the register file 46 could be integrated with the graphics engine 48 and can be included in the graphics controller. Therefore, the claim 14 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 15:

The claim 15 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “the set of registers includes a font pointer register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that the set of registers includes a font pointer register (column 5, lines 33-49). The Office interprets the text font address register as a font pointer register in the claimed invention because the reference teaches that the font address register *points* to an address of the character font set. Therefore, the claim 15 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 16:

The claim 16 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “the set of registers includes a font pitch register.” However,

Art Unit: 2672

Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that the set of registers includes a font pitch register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE Command Reg1 register as a font pitch register in the claimed invention because the TXE Command Reg1 register has bits information (5-3) of font pitch. Therefore, the claim 16 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 17:

The claim 17 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “the set of registers includes an index register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention that the set of registers includes an index register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE String Address register as an index register in the claimed invention that stores address of *character indexes*. Therefore, the claim 17 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 18:

The claim 18 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a horizontal information register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a horizontal information register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE Destination X register as a horizontal information register in the claimed invention because the TXE Destination X register stores onscreen X location (horizontal location) for text string to be drawn in accordance with the table 1 of the Lobodzinski reference. Therefore, the claim 18 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 19:

The claim 19 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a vertical information register.” However, Lobodzinski further

Art Unit: 2672

discloses claimed invention of a vertical information register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE Destination Y register as a vertical information register in the claimed invention because the TXE Destination Y register stores onscreen Y location (vertical location) for text string to be drawn in accordance with the table 1 of the Lobodzinski reference. Therefore, the claim 18 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 20:

The claim 20 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a linear information register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a linear information register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE String Address register or TXE Font Address register as a linear information register in the claimed invention because any of two registers stores *linear* dword address. Therefore, the claim 20 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 21:

The claim 21 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a glyph information register which holds character information retrieved by the graphics controller based upon the font pointer register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a glyph information register (see table 1).

Claim 22:

The claim 22 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a glyph information register which holds character information retrieved by the graphics controller based upon the font pitch register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a glyph information register (see table 1).

Art Unit: 2672

Claim 23:

The claim 23 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a glyph information register which holds character information retrieved by the graphics controller based upon the index register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a glyph information register (see table 1).

Claim 24:

The claim 24 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a size width register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a size width register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE Character Count register as a size width register in the claimed invention because the reference teaches that TXE Character Count register is the same as BLT width register and stores the number of text glyphs to be drawn. Therefore, the claim 20 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

Claim 25:

The claim 25 encompasses the same scope of the invention as that of claim 14 except additional claimed limitation of “a size height register.” However, Lobodzinski further discloses claimed invention of a size height register (see table 1). The Office interprets the TXE Height register as a size height register in the claimed invention because the reference teaches that TXE Height register is the same as BLT height register and stores the number of scan-lines of text to be drawn. Therefore, the claim 20 is rejected for the reason as set forth above.

16. Claim 26:

Art Unit: 2672

The Lobodzinski reference has taught a method for rendering fonts into a memory (see figure 1 of the reference) comprising the steps of (a) providing a data structure located within a memory (frame buffer 56 of figure 2) or other memories (memory 24 of figure 1) and the data structure including at least one font array (i.e., font 1, reference numeral 62a, and font 2, reference numeral 62b of figure 3 of the reference); (b) accessing at least one font array (i.e., font 1, reference numeral 62a, and font 2, reference numeral 62b); (c) rendering characters of at least one font array into the appropriate locations of a memory or other memories (i.e., frame buffer 56 of figure 2).

Claims 27-36:

Claims 27-36 is a rephrasing of claims 2-11 in a method form. The claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth respectively in claims 2-11.

Claims 37-43:

Claims 37-43 is a rephrasing of claims 14-20 in a method form. The claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth respectively in claims 14-20.

Claims 44-47:

Claims 44-47 is a rephrasing of claims 22-25 in a method form. The claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth respectively in claims 22-25.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2672

a. Hitchcock U.S. Patent No. 6,236,390 discloses a method and apparatus for rendering and displaying images such as text.

b. Kanungo U.S. Patent No. 5,870,084 discloses a system and method for receiving and rendering text in multiple languages.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jin-Cheng Wang whose telephone number is (703) 605-1213. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on (703) 305-4713. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-6606 for regular communications and (703) 308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 395-3900.

jcw
November 4, 2002



MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600